Mobility and Belonging in Local Contexts: Fairfax, Virginia (USA) and Fiuggi, Lazio (Italy)

By Darya Spiridonov

Introduction

Mobility and belonging are among the most decisive yet unevenly distributed forces shaping contemporary social life. In late modern societies, mobility is widely framed as a universal good: a source of opportunity, autonomy, and self-realization. Belonging, by contrast, is increasingly relegated to the private or symbolic sphere, valued emotionally but deprived of structural centrality. This imbalance has given rise to social formations in which individuals may move extensively across educational, professional, and geographic spaces while remaining weakly embedded in durable communities. At the same time, other social contexts continue to reproduce dense forms of belonging at the cost of limited mobility, generating social continuity alongside economic and symbolic immobility.

This article approaches mobility and belonging not as abstract ideals or individual preferences, but as socially produced conditions embedded in institutional arrangements, cultural expectations, and demographic trajectories. Rather than assuming a linear progression from rootedness to mobility as an index of modernization, it treats both phenomena as historically contingent and structurally regulated. Mobility does not automatically generate integration, just as belonging does not inherently produce social cohesion. Each configuration creates specific patterns of inclusion and exclusion, security and anxiety, autonomy and constraint.

The comparative perspective adopted here brings together two sharply contrasting social environments: Fairfax County, Virginia, and Fiuggi, a small town in the Italian province of Frosinone. Fairfax County represents a highly institutionalized and mobile social space shaped by federal governance, professional stratification, and continuous demographic turnover. Fiuggi, by contrast, exemplifies a localized social order

grounded in historical continuity, dense interpersonal networks, and a strong moral economy of place. These settings are not compared as equivalents, but as analytically productive opposites through which the tension between movement and attachment becomes visible.

The choice of these cases is guided by a sociological interest in how late modern societies manage the trade-off between mobility and belonging under conditions of globalization, economic restructuring, and cultural fragmentation. While Fairfax County demonstrates how mobility can be maximized through institutional efficiency and meritocratic ideology, it also reveals the fragility of social attachment in highly competitive environments. Fiuggi, conversely, illustrates how belonging can remain socially binding even as opportunities for upward or outward mobility contract, producing stability that is simultaneously protective and restrictive.

By examining these contrasting configurations, the article seeks to illuminate how social structures shape not only life chances but also subjectivity, moral expectations, and everyday practices. Mobility and belonging emerge here not as mutually exclusive categories, but as relational dimensions whose imbalance defines the lived experience of late modernity. Understanding this imbalance is essential for assessing the social sustainability of contemporary societies, particularly in contexts where institutional rationalization and cultural continuity pull in opposing directions.

Part I

Two Modes of Social Regulation in Late Modernity

Late modern societies are increasingly defined not by the absence of regulation, but by the proliferation of distinct and often incompatible modes through which social order is produced and maintained. Regulation in this context should not be understood narrowly as legal enforcement or formal governance. Rather, it encompasses the full range of institutional, cultural, and relational mechanisms that structure conduct, distribute legitimacy, and define the boundaries of acceptable behavior. The

comparison between Fairfax County and Fiuggi reveals two contrasting yet equally robust regimes of social regulation, each responding to the pressures of late modernity through different logics of control, integration, and moral evaluation.

In Fairfax County, social regulation is predominantly institutionalized, abstract, and procedural. Order is generated through dense bureaucratic infrastructures, standardized rules, and meritocratic norms that operate independently of personal familiarity or local history. The legitimacy of regulation derives from its formal rationality: rules are expected to be impersonal, transparent, and universally applicable. This produces a social environment in which predictability is achieved through codification rather than through shared memory or interpersonal obligation. Individuals are regulated not because they are known, but precisely because they are interchangeable within institutional frameworks.

Such a mode of regulation is inseparable from high levels of mobility. Geographic relocation, occupational change, and social re-positioning are normalized and often required for professional advancement. Regulation therefore must function without reliance on stable community ties. Compliance is secured through credentials, performance metrics, and continuous evaluation rather than through moral reputation in the classical sense. The subject is addressed as a bearer of qualifications and roles, not as a member of a historically situated collective. This produces a form of social order that is efficient and scalable, but also thin in terms of symbolic attachment.

The institutional density of Fairfax County extends into everyday life. Education systems, workplaces, healthcare structures, and even leisure spaces are governed by formalized procedures and expert authority. Deviance is managed through administrative mechanisms rather than communal intervention. Conflict tends to be juridified or bureaucratized, translated into complaints, reports, and compliance processes. The moral language accompanying regulation emphasizes responsibility, professionalism, and risk management. Failure is individualized and interpreted as insufficient adaptation rather than as a breakdown of social solidarity.

By contrast, Fiuggi exemplifies a mode of social regulation grounded in social

embeddedness and moral proximity. Here, regulation operates primarily through informal networks, shared histories, and enduring interpersonal visibility. Social order is maintained not through abstract rules alone, but through continuous social observation and the accumulation of reputational knowledge. Individuals are regulated because they are known, remembered, and situated within a dense web of relationships that extends across generations.

In this context, regulation is inseparable from belonging. Social norms are enforced through expectations tied to family reputation, local continuity, and conformity to established patterns of conduct. Deviance is rarely anonymous and seldom neutral. It is interpreted within a moral framework that links individual behavior to collective standing. Sanctions are often symbolic rather than formal, taking the form of social exclusion, gossip, or reputational damage. While legal institutions exist, their practical effectiveness is frequently mediated by informal arrangements and personal mediation.

This form of regulation produces a strong sense of social coherence, but it also limits individual autonomy. Mobility—whether social, geographic, or symbolic—can be perceived as a threat to collective stability. Aspirations that diverge from locally sanctioned trajectories may encounter resistance or moral suspicion. Regulation thus functions not only to preserve order but to reproduce continuity, often privileging the familiar over the innovative. Stability is achieved through repetition rather than through adaptation.

The contrast between these two modes of regulation illustrates a fundamental tension within late modernity. Institutionalized regulation prioritizes flexibility, scalability, and formal equality, but often at the cost of emotional security and durable social attachment. Embedded regulation prioritizes continuity, mutual recognition, and moral density, but often constrains individual differentiation and outward mobility. Neither regime represents an unambiguous solution to the problem of social order under conditions of rapid change.

Importantly, these modes are not simply reflections of size or level of development.

They are historically produced responses to broader structural pressures, including economic restructuring, state formation, and cultural narratives of legitimacy. Fairfax County's regulatory regime is closely linked to its integration into national and transnational institutional systems, where efficiency and accountability are paramount. Fiuggi's regime reflects a longer history of peripheralization, where social survival depended on internal cohesion and the management of scarcity through relational obligation.

The implications of these regulatory modes extend beyond governance into the formation of subjectivity. In institutionalized environments, individuals are encouraged to internalize external standards, becoming self-regulating subjects who monitor their own performance and compliance. Autonomy is framed as the capacity to navigate systems effectively. In embedded environments, subjectivity is shaped through relational accountability. The self is constituted in relation to others, and moral worth is assessed through adherence to collective expectations rather than through individual achievement alone.

These differences also affect how social trust is produced. In Fairfax County, trust is largely systemic: confidence is placed in institutions, procedures, and credentials rather than in persons. In Fiuggi, trust is personal and cumulative, built through repeated interaction and shared experience. Each form of trust has vulnerabilities. Systemic trust can erode rapidly in moments of institutional failure, while personal trust can become exclusionary and resistant to change.

What emerges from this comparison is not a binary opposition between modernity and tradition, but two distinct configurations of regulation operating within the same historical epoch. Late modernity does not eliminate older forms of social control; it reorganizes their relative importance and spheres of influence. Fairfax County and Fiuggi represent different equilibria between abstraction and proximity, procedure and memory, mobility and belonging.

Understanding these equilibria is essential for grasping the social consequences of contemporary transformations. As societies confront increasing pressures toward

mobility—economic, demographic, and cultural—the question is not whether regulation will persist, but how it will be reconfigured. The cases examined here demonstrate that regulation remains central to social life, but its forms profoundly shape the possibilities of integration, autonomy, and collective sustainability.

In this sense, the comparison of Fairfax County and Fiuggi offers a lens through which to examine broader dynamics of late modern social order. It reveals how different regulatory regimes distribute opportunities and constraints unevenly, producing distinct experiences of freedom, security, and obligation. Mobility without belonging and belonging without mobility emerge not as anomalies, but as structurally generated outcomes of divergent modes of social regulation.

Part II
Demographic Asymmetry and Cultural Reproduction

Demographic structures are never neutral backdrops to social life. They actively condition cultural expectations, temporal horizons, and the perceived legitimacy of social arrangements. In late modern societies, demographic change increasingly operates as a silent regulator of social meaning, shaping what is considered normal, possible, or desirable. The comparison between Fairfax County and Fiuggi reveals a profound demographic asymmetry that underpins divergent modes of cultural reproduction. This asymmetry is not reducible to numerical indicators such as population growth or decline; it concerns the ways in which demographic dynamics organize collective time, intergenerational relations, and the symbolic valuation of the future.

Fairfax County is characterized by demographic expansion and continuous population turnover. Its growth is sustained by internal migration, international immigration, and the constant inflow of highly educated professionals and their families. Demography here functions as a mechanism of renewal rather than continuity. The population is comparatively young, professionally active, and oriented toward future-oriented

investments, particularly in education and career advancement. This demographic dynamism produces a cultural environment in which change is normalized and stability is provisional.

Cultural reproduction in such a context is largely decoupled from place. Norms, values, and expectations are transmitted less through long-term communal memory than through institutions designed to standardize socialization across heterogeneous populations. Schools, professional organizations, and expert systems play a central role in reproducing cultural competence. What is reproduced is not a local culture in the classical sense, but a portable repertoire of skills, dispositions, and credentials that enable individuals to remain competitive across contexts.

This form of cultural reproduction privileges adaptability over rootedness. Intergenerational transmission is structured around the anticipation of mobility: children are prepared not to inherit a place, but to navigate systems. Family strategies emphasize accumulation of human capital, linguistic and cultural flexibility, and early alignment with institutional expectations. The future is imagined as open, but also as demanding continuous preparation. Demography thus reinforces a temporal orientation toward anticipation rather than memory.

Fiuggi presents an inverse demographic configuration. Population decline, aging, and the out-migration of younger cohorts have reshaped the town's social landscape. Here, demography does not signal renewal but contraction. The future is not absent, but it is demographically thin and symbolically fragile. This condition profoundly affects cultural reproduction, which remains strongly place-based but increasingly disconnected from generational succession.

In Fiuggi, cultural reproduction relies heavily on repetition rather than expansion. Traditions, norms, and local narratives are transmitted within relatively stable networks, often within families that have occupied the same social space for generations. Cultural competence is less about adaptability to external systems and more about familiarity with local codes, histories, and moral expectations. Belonging is learned through proximity, observation, and participation in shared routines rather

than through formalized instruction.

However, the demographic weakening of younger generations introduces a structural tension into this mode of reproduction. Cultural continuity persists, but its carriers diminish. Practices and values are maintained even as their social relevance erodes beyond the local context. The result is a form of cultural density that is increasingly detached from economic and demographic viability. Cultural reproduction becomes inward-looking, oriented toward preservation rather than projection.

This contrast highlights a crucial difference in how time is socially organized. In Fairfax County, demographic growth supports a future-oriented temporal regime. Social life is structured around planning, forecasting, and investment. Cultural reproduction aligns with this temporality by emphasizing skills and dispositions that promise future returns. In Fiuggi, demographic decline reinforces a present- and past-oriented regime, where cultural reproduction serves to stabilize identity in the absence of credible future expansion.

The demographic asymmetry between these two contexts also shapes the meaning of generational relations. In Fairfax County, generational succession is embedded in a narrative of progress. Younger generations are expected to surpass their predecessors in education and professional status. This expectation, while motivating, also intensifies pressure and competition. Intergenerational relations are future-facing but often emotionally compressed, mediated by institutional schedules and performance benchmarks.

In Fiuggi, generational relations are more visibly continuous but less dynamic. Younger individuals often remain socially dependent on older generations for longer periods, particularly in the absence of stable employment opportunities. Authority and cultural legitimacy tend to reside with elders, whose experiences anchor collective memory. While this can provide emotional security, it may also limit the space for generational innovation. Cultural reproduction thus becomes conservative not by ideology, but by demographic necessity.

Migration plays a central role in reinforcing these dynamics. In Fairfax County,

migration is constitutive. Newcomers are continuously integrated into institutional frameworks that minimize cultural disruption. Diversity is managed through procedural inclusion rather than through deep cultural integration. The result is a form of pluralism that is demographically robust but symbolically thin. Cultural reproduction focuses on compatibility rather than synthesis.

In Fiuggi, migration is experienced differently. In-migration is limited and often perceived as disruptive to established social equilibria, while out-migration represents a loss of cultural and demographic capital. The departure of younger residents weakens the mechanisms through which culture is reproduced across generations. Those who remain often shoulder the dual burden of maintaining cultural continuity and compensating for demographic absence.

The asymmetry in demographic trajectories thus produces contrasting cultural pathologies. In Fairfax County, the rapid circulation of populations can erode long-term social memory, leading to a sense of placelessness despite material prosperity. Cultural reproduction becomes efficient but emotionally attenuated. In Fiuggi, cultural memory remains dense, but its reproduction risks becoming ritualized and disconnected from lived opportunity.

These dynamics have significant implications for social inequality. In mobility-oriented contexts, demographic growth can mask exclusion by framing failure as individual rather than structural. Those unable to adapt to the demands of constant mobility may experience marginalization without collective recognition. In belonging-oriented contexts, demographic stagnation can naturalize inequality by embedding it within long-standing social hierarchies that appear immutable.

Demographic asymmetry also reshapes the symbolic value of youth and age. In Fairfax County, youth is associated with potential and investment, while aging is often framed as a problem to be managed institutionally. In Fiuggi, aging is normalized and culturally integrated, while youth becomes a scarce and ambivalent resource—valued symbolically but often unsupported structurally. These valuations further influence cultural reproduction by shaping aspirations and self-perception.

Ultimately, the comparison reveals that demographic conditions are inseparable from cultural reproduction in late modern societies. Fairfax County and Fiuggi demonstrate how different demographic trajectories generate distinct cultural logics, temporal orientations, and intergenerational arrangements. Neither configuration resolves the tension between continuity and change. Instead, each institutionalizes a particular imbalance: demographic abundance paired with cultural thinness, or cultural density paired with demographic fragility.

Understanding this asymmetry is essential for grasping how societies reproduce themselves under conditions of unequal mobility and uneven belonging. Demography does not merely describe populations; it structures the possibilities through which culture is transmitted, contested, and transformed. In this sense, demographic asymmetry stands at the core of the broader tension explored in this article, linking structural conditions to lived experience in profoundly consequential ways.

Part III
Subjectivity, Emotional Economy, and Everyday Behavioral Patterns

Late modern forms of social regulation and demographic organization do not merely shape institutions or collective trajectories; they penetrate deeply into the formation of subjectivity and the texture of everyday life. Psychological dispositions, emotional repertoires, and habitual patterns of behavior emerge at the intersection of structural constraints and culturally sanctioned expectations. The comparison between Fairfax County and Fiuggi reveals two markedly different emotional economies and forms of subject formation, each corresponding to the broader configurations of mobility and belonging analyzed in the preceding sections.

In Fairfax County, subjectivity is shaped within an environment of continuous evaluation and anticipatory pressure. Individuals are socialized into a regime in which personal worth is closely linked to performance, adaptability, and future potential. Emotional life is structured around the management of risk and uncertainty, with

success framed as provisional and contingent upon sustained effort. This produces a form of disciplined subjectivity characterized by self-monitoring, strategic planning, and emotional containment.

Everyday behavior in such a context reflects the internalization of institutional logics. Time is experienced as scarce and instrumental, organized around schedules, deadlines, and optimization. Social interactions tend to be polite, efficient, and bounded, often governed by professional norms even outside formal work settings. Emotional expression is regulated not through explicit prohibition but through implicit expectations of composure and competence. Vulnerability is acknowledged primarily within therapeutic or privatized contexts rather than in public or communal spaces.

Psychological distress in Fairfax County is frequently individualized and medicalized. Anxiety, burnout, and emotional fatigue are interpreted as personal challenges requiring self-management or professional intervention. While this approach can reduce stigma and expand access to care, it also obscures the structural origins of distress. Emotional difficulties are framed as failures of coping rather than as consequences of systemic pressure. Subjectivity thus becomes a site of continuous adjustment to institutional demands.

In contrast, subjectivity in Fiuggi is constituted within dense relational environments where emotional life is publicly legible and socially consequential. Individuals are embedded in networks of familiarity that generate both support and scrutiny. Emotional expression is more openly integrated into everyday interaction, but this expressiveness is accompanied by reduced privacy. Feelings are not merely personal states; they are relational signals interpreted within a shared moral framework.

Behavioral patterns in Fiuggi reflect a slower and more cyclical experience of time. Daily routines are less rigidly structured, and social life unfolds through repeated encounters rather than scheduled appointments. This temporal rhythm fosters a sense of continuity and existential grounding, but it can also limit perceived agency. Aspirations are often negotiated in relation to collective expectations, and deviation from established paths may provoke moral commentary rather than institutional

sanction.

Psychological distress in Fiuggi is less likely to be articulated in clinical terms. Emotional suffering is often interpreted through relational or moral narratives, linked to family conflict, social exclusion, or perceived failure to meet communal norms. While this can provide meaning and shared understanding, it may also inhibit access to professional support and reinforce stigmatization. The boundary between emotional life and moral judgment remains porous.

These contrasting emotional economies shape how individuals relate to authority and responsibility. In Fairfax County, responsibility is internalized; individuals are expected to regulate themselves in accordance with abstract standards. Authority operates impersonally, mediated through procedures and expert knowledge. In Fiuggi, responsibility is relational; behavior is evaluated in light of its impact on others and on collective reputation. Authority is often personalized and negotiated through social proximity.

The experience of autonomy differs accordingly. In mobility-oriented contexts, autonomy is defined as the capacity to choose among options and to reposition oneself strategically. This form of autonomy is expansive in principle but demanding in practice, requiring constant emotional and cognitive labor. In belonging-oriented contexts, autonomy is constrained by relational obligations but supported by social continuity. Individuals may experience limited choice alongside a stronger sense of being held within a social world.

These differences extend to the formation of moral expectations. In Fairfax County, morality is closely linked to notions of fairness, professionalism, and individual responsibility. Ethical conduct is evaluated through compliance with rules and respect for procedural norms. In Fiuggi, morality is embedded in interpersonal loyalty, reciprocity, and adherence to tradition. Ethical evaluation is situational and historically informed rather than abstract.

The psychological consequences of these regimes become particularly visible in moments of crisis or transition. In highly mobile environments, disruption often leads

to isolation, as social ties are contingent and replaceable. Individuals may possess extensive networks yet lack durable sources of emotional support. In embedded environments, crisis activates dense support structures, but it may also intensify social control and limit individual coping strategies.

What emerges from this comparison is not a hierarchy of psychological well-being, but two distinct configurations of subjectivity shaped by structural conditions. Fairfax County produces subjects who are resilient, adaptable, and future-oriented, yet often burdened by chronic stress and emotional self-regulation. Fiuggi produces subjects who are relationally grounded and emotionally expressive, yet constrained by visibility and limited horizons for change.

These patterns illustrate how mobility and belonging operate not only as social facts but as lived psychological conditions. Subjectivity in late modernity is unevenly distributed, reflecting the different ways societies organize time, expectation, and moral worth. Emotional life becomes a key site where structural tensions are absorbed, negotiated, or resisted.

By situating psychological and behavioral patterns within their broader sociological and demographic contexts, this analysis underscores the inseparability of inner life and social structure. The contrast between Fairfax County and Fiuggi demonstrates that the experience of being a subject in late modern society is profoundly shaped by the balance—or imbalance—between movement and attachment. Mobility without belonging and belonging without mobility thus emerge as distinct psychological regimes, each carrying its own forms of strain, resilience, and meaning.

Part IV

The Unequal Distribution of Cognitive Capital in Late Modern Societies: Fairfax County (Virginia, USA) and Fiuggi (Lazio, Italy): Education and Intellectual Stratification

In late modern societies, inequality is no longer structured solely through income,

property, or occupational status. Increasingly, it is mediated through the uneven distribution of cognitive capital: the socially recognized capacity to produce, interpret, and legitimize knowledge. Cognitive capital encompasses formal education, access to intellectual infrastructures, familiarity with dominant epistemic codes, and proximity to institutions that define what counts as valid expertise. Its distribution profoundly shapes social hierarchies, patterns of mobility, and the symbolic boundaries of belonging.

A comparison between Fairfax County, located in the Commonwealth of Virginia in the United States, and Fiuggi, a town in the Province of Frosinone in the Lazio region of Italy, reveals two sharply contrasting regimes of cognitive capital accumulation and circulation. These differences are not reducible to national educational systems alone. Rather, they emerge from the interaction between institutional density, labor markets, demographic composition, and historically sedimented cultural expectations regarding knowledge and authority.

Fairfax County constitutes one of the most cognitively saturated environments in the United States. Its proximity to federal institutions, research agencies, universities, policy think tanks, and technologically advanced industries produces an exceptionally high concentration of formally educated individuals. Advanced degrees are not merely credentials; they function as baseline requirements for participation in the dominant occupational strata. Cognitive capital here is both abundant and highly institutionalized, embedded in professional hierarchies and continuously reproduced through formal mechanisms of evaluation and certification.

Education in Fairfax County is organized around the anticipation of intellectual competition. Primary and secondary schooling is oriented toward performance metrics, standardized testing, and early differentiation. Higher education is framed as a strategic investment rather than as a cultural pursuit. Knowledge is valued instrumentally, as a resource that enables access to prestigious positions within complex institutional systems. Intellectual capacity is measured, ranked, and translated into career trajectories with remarkable efficiency.

This environment produces a distinctive form of intellectual stratification. Inequality does not arise from the absence of education, but from differentiation within an already highly educated population. The key dividing lines concern institutional affiliation, specialization, and proximity to centers of epistemic authority. Cognitive capital is unevenly distributed even among those who possess similar formal qualifications. The result is a hierarchy based not simply on what one knows, but on where and how that knowledge is recognized.

Crucially, intellectual life in Fairfax County is decoupled from locality. Knowledge production and validation occur within translocal and often global networks. Intellectual legitimacy derives from alignment with dominant paradigms and institutional standards rather than from local relevance. This produces a form of intellectual cosmopolitanism that facilitates mobility but weakens place-based cultural identity. The individual is valued as a carrier of transferable expertise, not as a custodian of local knowledge.

Fiuggi presents a fundamentally different configuration. Located in a peripheral area of central Italy, within the Lazio region but outside major metropolitan centers, Fiuggi operates under conditions of limited intellectual infrastructure. Formal educational attainment is uneven, and advanced academic credentials are comparatively rare. However, this does not imply an absence of knowledge or intelligence. Rather, it reflects a different regime of cognitive capital, one in which intellectual resources are weakly institutionalized and unevenly valorized.

Education in Fiuggi is often experienced as a pathway out rather than as a means of local advancement. Higher education typically requires geographic mobility, and those who acquire significant cognitive capital frequently leave the town to access professional opportunities elsewhere. As a result, intellectual accumulation and local reproduction are structurally misaligned. Cognitive capital is exported rather than reinvested, contributing to demographic decline and intellectual depletion.

Within the local social order, intellectual stratification operates through informal mechanisms. Cultural authority is less closely tied to formal education than to social

seniority, family reputation, and practical competence. Local knowledge—familiarity with people, histories, and unwritten rules—often carries greater symbolic weight than abstract expertise. This produces a form of intellectual hierarchy that privileges embeddedness over formal qualification.

At the same time, this configuration generates ambivalence toward institutional knowledge. External expertise may be perceived as socially distant or insufficiently attuned to local realities. Intellectual authority is personalized rather than abstract, negotiated through relationships rather than conferred by credentials. While this can preserve social cohesion, it also limits the capacity for systematic innovation and critical challenge.

The contrast between Fairfax County and Fiuggi thus reveals two distinct patterns of intellectual stratification. In Fairfax County, cognitive capital is abundant but sharply differentiated, producing intense competition and symbolic exclusion within a formally egalitarian system. In Fiuggi, cognitive capital is scarce and weakly institutionalized, producing stability but also intellectual stagnation. In both cases, inequality is reproduced not through ignorance, but through the differential social valuation of knowledge.

These differences have significant implications for social mobility. In Fairfax County, mobility is conditional upon the continuous accumulation and renewal of cognitive capital. Education functions as both an enabler and a filter, facilitating upward movement for some while excluding others through increasingly complex credentialing regimes. In Fiuggi, mobility is constrained by the limited local returns to education. Cognitive capital enables exit more readily than transformation, reinforcing the separation between those who remain and those who leave.

The unequal distribution of cognitive capital also shapes political culture and civic participation. In highly educated environments, public discourse is often technocratic, privileging expert knowledge and procedural rationality. This can enhance policy effectiveness but also alienate those who lack the requisite cognitive resources. In peripheral contexts, civic life is more relational and experiential, but less open to

evidence-based intervention. Intellectual inequality thus intersects with democratic inequality in subtle but consequential ways.

Importantly, these regimes are not static. Globalization, digitalization, and remote work are altering the geography of cognitive capital, potentially enabling new forms of intellectual circulation. However, the underlying asymmetries persist. Fairfax County continues to attract and concentrate expertise, while towns like Fiuggi struggle to retain it. Without structural intervention, these patterns are likely to intensify rather than converge.

The comparison underscores a central argument of this article: cognitive capital is a key mediator between mobility and belonging in late modern societies. Where it is densely concentrated and institutionally rewarded, mobility expands at the cost of local attachment. Where it is weakly integrated and socially undervalued, belonging persists at the cost of intellectual dynamism. Understanding this imbalance is essential for any serious analysis of contemporary inequality.

By situating education and intellectual stratification within their broader sociological context, this chapter demonstrates that the unequal distribution of cognitive capital is not merely an educational issue, but a structural feature of late modern social organization. Fairfax County and Fiuggi exemplify how different social environments allocate, recognize, and constrain intellectual resources, producing divergent life chances and forms of collective self-understanding.

A further dimension of cognitive inequality between Fairfax County and Fiuggi concerns the social visibility of intellectual labor and the everyday presence of knowledge-producing activities. In Fairfax County, intellectual work is not marginal or exceptional; it constitutes a dominant and normalized form of social activity. Policy analysis, legal reasoning, scientific research, data management, and strategic planning permeate the occupational structure. Knowledge production is spatially concentrated in offices, campuses, and institutional complexes that are integrated into the daily landscape. As a result, intellectual activity acquires a taken-for-granted quality, shaping conversational norms, social expectations, and even informal interaction.

This constant exposure to cognitive labor produces a population that is habituated to abstract reasoning, formal argumentation, and future-oriented problem solving. Intellectual competence becomes a socially legible attribute, recognizable through language use, rhetorical style, and familiarity with expert discourse. Importantly, this does not imply universal intellectual depth, but rather a widespread fluency in the codes through which knowledge is articulated and validated. Cognitive capital thus circulates not only through formal education, but through everyday immersion in an intellectually saturated environment.

In Fiuggi, by contrast, intellectual labor is largely invisible within the local economy. Knowledge-intensive professions are underrepresented, and spaces dedicated to research, analysis, or higher-level education are largely absent. Intellectual activity tends to be spatially and socially displaced, occurring elsewhere and often associated with departure rather than local engagement. As a result, abstract knowledge lacks everyday presence and symbolic reinforcement. It does not shape the rhythm of public life or the dominant modes of interaction.

This absence has significant consequences for how intelligence itself is socially perceived. In Fiuggi, intellectual distinction is often ambiguous in status. While formal education may command respect in principle, it does not automatically translate into social authority or influence. Practical competence, social intuition, and familiarity with local dynamics frequently outweigh abstract expertise in determining legitimacy. Intellectual capital thus remains weakly convertible into social capital within the local field.

Another crucial distinction concerns the relationship between cognitive capital and language. In Fairfax County, language functions as a primary vehicle of intellectual stratification. Mastery of specialized vocabularies, bureaucratic idioms, and professional registers signals belonging to particular cognitive elites. Linguistic precision and conceptual clarity are rewarded, while communicative competence becomes a key mechanism of inclusion or exclusion. Language is not merely expressive; it is performative, actively producing intellectual hierarchy.

In Fiuggi, linguistic practices serve a different function. Communication prioritizes relational attunement over conceptual precision. Language is embedded in shared context, gesture, and implicit understanding. While this facilitates social cohesion, it limits the circulation of abstract or critical discourse. Intellectual disagreement may be personalized, and analytical distance can be interpreted as social detachment. This further constrains the public expression of cognitive capital.

Educational trajectories reinforce these differences. In Fairfax County, education is cumulative and continuous. Learning does not end with formal schooling but extends throughout the life course through professional training, certification, and informal knowledge exchange. Cognitive capital is expected to grow and adapt, mirroring the demands of an evolving institutional environment. Failure to update one's knowledge risks rapid obsolescence.

In Fiuggi, educational trajectories are more discontinuous. Formal education often represents a discrete phase rather than a lifelong process. Opportunities for continuing intellectual development are limited locally, and adult learning is weakly institutionalized. Cognitive capital, once acquired, may stagnate or become socially irrelevant unless accompanied by geographic mobility. This reinforces a temporal disconnect between education and everyday life.

The intergenerational implications of these regimes are particularly significant. In Fairfax County, parents actively invest in the cognitive development of children through structured activities, educational enrichment, and strategic planning. Childhood is framed as a preparatory stage for future intellectual competition. Cognitive capital is thus reproduced deliberately and intensively, reinforcing existing inequalities while maintaining high overall levels of educational attainment.

In Fiuggi, intergenerational transmission of knowledge follows a different pattern. Informal learning, observation, and experiential knowledge play a central role. While this fosters practical intelligence and social sensitivity, it does not easily translate into formal cognitive capital recognized beyond the local context. Children who pursue higher education often do so by distancing themselves from local structures, creating a

rupture rather than a continuity in cognitive reproduction.

These divergent patterns contribute to distinct forms of intellectual self-perception. In Fairfax County, individuals are encouraged to view themselves as cognitive agents, responsible for managing their own intellectual portfolios. Knowledge becomes a personal asset requiring constant investment. In Fiuggi, intellectual ambition may be experienced ambivalently, as both a potential resource and a source of social dislocation. The pursuit of abstract knowledge can appear socially risky, threatening established bonds.

The unequal distribution of cognitive capital also shapes collective imaginaries. In Fairfax County, the future is imagined as cognitively navigable: problems are expected to yield to analysis, expertise, and planning. This fosters confidence in institutional solutions but can also generate technocratic blindness to social complexity. In Fiuggi, the future is more opaque and less cognitively articulated. Uncertainty is managed through continuity rather than prediction, reinforcing reliance on tradition and relational stability.

These contrasts underscore that cognitive inequality is not merely a matter of educational access, but of social ecology. Cognitive capital flourishes where institutions, language, labor markets, and cultural expectations align to reward intellectual engagement. Where these conditions are absent or fragmented, cognitive resources remain underutilized and socially marginal, regardless of individual capacity.

The comparison between Fairfax County and Fiuggi thus reveals how late modern societies produce not only unequal distributions of wealth and mobility, but unequal conditions for thinking itself. Intellectual life becomes expansive, visible, and socially rewarded in some contexts, while remaining constrained, localized, and weakly institutionalized in others. This disparity profoundly shapes how individuals understand their possibilities, their limitations, and their place within the social order.

In this light, cognitive capital emerges as a critical hinge between mobility and belonging. Where it is densely concentrated and socially valorized, mobility is

sustained through continuous intellectual differentiation. Where it is weakly integrated into local structures, belonging persists but at the cost of intellectual circulation and renewal. The unequal distribution of cognitive capital thus constitutes a central mechanism through which late modern societies reproduce both opportunity and exclusion.

Conclusion

This comparative sociological study set out to examine a tension that has become increasingly central to late modern social life: the growing disjunction between mobility and belonging. Through an in-depth comparison of Fairfax County in the Commonwealth of Virginia, United States, and Fiuggi in the Province of Frosinone, Lazio, Italy, the analysis has demonstrated that this tension is not an abstract cultural dilemma, nor a matter of individual choice. It is a structurally produced condition, embedded in institutional arrangements, demographic trajectories, regimes of social regulation, and unequal distributions of cognitive capital.

The central contribution of this research lies in its refusal to treat mobility and belonging as mutually exclusive or normatively ordered categories. Rather than framing one as inherently progressive and the other as residual or regressive, the study has shown that both are socially organized under specific historical and structural conditions. Each generates distinct configurations of opportunity and constraint, integration and exclusion, psychological resilience and vulnerability. Late modernity does not dissolve belonging in favor of mobility, nor does it preserve belonging without cost. Instead, it redistributes them unevenly across social spaces.

The case of Fairfax County illustrates how mobility can be institutionally maximized through dense bureaucratic infrastructures, credential-based stratification, and the concentration of cognitive capital. Here, mobility is not merely tolerated but actively demanded. Individuals are expected to circulate across roles, institutions, and geographic locations, continuously recalibrating their skills and identities. This

produces a form of social order that is highly adaptive, scalable, and future-oriented. Yet it also reveals the fragility of social attachment in contexts where belonging is weakly institutionalized and emotionally privatized.

Conversely, the case of Fiuggi demonstrates how belonging can remain socially binding even under conditions of economic marginalization and demographic decline. Social regulation operates through relational proximity, moral memory, and reputational continuity rather than through abstract procedures. This produces a form of social coherence that offers emotional security and identity stability. At the same time, it constrains mobility, limits the social valorization of cognitive capital, and narrows the horizon of possible futures. Belonging here is not a neutral good; it is a socially enforced condition with ambivalent consequences.

Taken together, these cases reveal that late modern societies do not converge toward a single model of social organization. Instead, they crystallize different equilibria between abstraction and proximity, flexibility and continuity, institutional rationality and moral embeddedness. These equilibria are not accidental. They are produced through long-term interactions between state structures, labor markets, educational systems, and cultural narratives of legitimacy.

A key analytical insight emerging from this study concerns the role of social regulation. Regulation persists as a central organizing force in both contexts, but it operates through fundamentally different modalities. In highly mobile environments, regulation is institutionalized, impersonal, and procedural. It governs conduct through metrics, credentials, and formal accountability. In belonging-oriented environments, regulation is embedded, personalized, and moralized. It governs conduct through visibility, memory, and relational obligation. Neither mode is inherently more humane or more oppressive; each generates its own forms of discipline and resistance.

The analysis further demonstrates that demographic dynamics play a decisive role in shaping cultural reproduction and temporal orientation. Demographic growth and turnover, as observed in Fairfax County, support a future-oriented regime in which planning, anticipation, and investment dominate social imagination. Demographic

contraction and aging, as observed in Fiuggi, reinforce a present- and past-oriented regime in which preservation and repetition take precedence. These temporal regimes profoundly influence how societies interpret risk, responsibility, and change.

Perhaps most importantly, this study foregrounds the unequal distribution of cognitive capital as a central mechanism linking mobility and belonging. Cognitive capital—understood as the socially recognized capacity to produce and legitimate knowledge—is not merely an educational variable. It is a structural resource that mediates access to mobility, shapes intellectual stratification, and defines whose interpretations of reality carry authority. Where cognitive capital is densely concentrated and institutionally rewarded, as in Fairfax County, mobility expands but belonging weakens. Where cognitive capital is weakly integrated into local social structures, as in Fiuggi, belonging persists but intellectual dynamism contracts.

This finding has significant implications for contemporary debates on inequality. It suggests that social stratification in late modern societies increasingly operates through epistemic mechanisms. Inequality is reproduced not only through income differentials or occupational hierarchies, but through differential access to the means of understanding, interpreting, and influencing social reality. Cognitive inequality thus intersects with democratic inequality, shaping whose voices are heard, whose expertise is trusted, and whose experiences are rendered visible.

The psychological dimensions explored in this study further underscore the lived consequences of these structural arrangements. Mobility-oriented environments produce subjects who are resilient, adaptable, and cognitively skilled, yet often burdened by chronic stress and emotional self-regulation. Belonging-oriented environments produce subjects who are relationally grounded and emotionally expressive, yet constrained by social visibility and limited horizons for transformation. These are not individual pathologies but socially patterned responses to structural conditions.

From a theoretical perspective, the findings of this research challenge simplistic narratives of modernization and progress. They call into question the assumption that

increased mobility necessarily leads to greater freedom or social integration, just as they complicate idealized notions of community and tradition. Late modernity emerges here as a condition of structural imbalance rather than linear advancement, characterized by the uneven allocation of social resources and existential possibilities.

Methodologically, the comparative approach adopted in this study demonstrates the value of asymmetrical comparison. By juxtaposing two structurally unequal contexts without forcing equivalence, the analysis reveals underlying logics that would remain invisible within a single-case framework. The comparison between Fairfax County and Fiuggi is not intended to produce generalizable typologies in a narrow sense. Rather, it serves as an analytical lens through which broader dynamics of late modern social organization can be examined.

The implications of this research extend beyond the specific cases analyzed. As globalization, digitalization, and institutional rationalization continue to reshape social life, societies will increasingly confront the challenge of reconciling mobility with meaningful forms of belonging. The findings presented here suggest that this reconciliation cannot be achieved through policy instruments alone. It requires a rethinking of how social value is assigned, how knowledge is recognized, and how collective life is organized across scales.

Ultimately, this study argues that the tension between mobility and belonging is not a temporary imbalance to be corrected, but a constitutive feature of late modern societies. The question is not whether mobility or belonging should prevail, but how their relationship is structured, regulated, and experienced. By illuminating the social mechanisms through which this tension is produced and lived, the research contributes to a more nuanced understanding of contemporary inequality, subjectivity, and social sustainability.

In this sense, the comparative analysis of Fairfax County and Fiuggi offers more than a localized study. It provides a framework for thinking about the future of social cohesion in a world marked by uneven movement, unequal knowledge, and fragile attachments. Recognizing these dynamics is a necessary step toward any serious

sociological engagement with the conditions under which late modern societies remain not only functional, but intelligible and livable.